

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JAMES SAULS,

Case No. 2:20-cv-01269-JAD-VCF

Plaintiff

V.

CORE CIVIC, et. al.,

Order Dismissing and Closing Case

Defendants

[ECF No. 6]

Plaintiff James Sauls brought this civil-rights lawsuit to redress constitutional violations claims he suffered while he was at the Southern Nevada Detention Center. On January 21, this court ordered Sauls to update his address by February 19, 2021.¹ That deadline passed without an updated address from the plaintiff.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.² A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.³ In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the court must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious

¹ ECF No. 8.

²⁰ ² *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

³ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
2 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
3 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁴

The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.⁵ A court’s warning to a party that its failure to obey the court’s order will result in dismissal satisfies the fifth factor’s “consideration of alternatives” requirement,⁶ and that warning was given here.⁷ The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **THIS ACTION IS DISMISSED** without prejudice
14 based on the plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's January
15 20, 2021, order, **and all pending motions are DENIED as moot**. The Clerk of Court is directed
16 to **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly and **CLOSE THIS CASE**. If Sauls wishes to pursue his
17 claims, he must file a complaint in a new case. **No further documents may be filed in this**
18 **closed case.**

Dated: February 26, 2021

U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

⁴ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

⁵ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

23 ⁶ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

⁷ ECF No. 8.